



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT CASES.

ASSIGNMENTS—EQUITABLE ASSIGNMENTS—CHECKS.—*KUHNES v. CAHILL*, 104 N. W. 1025 (IOWA).—*Held*, the giving of a check on a general deposit fund in a bank, amounts to an equitable assignment *pro tanto* of the fund.

The weight of authority, both in England and this country, is in opposition to the above ruling. *Laclede Bank v. Schuler*, 120 U. S. 511; *Com. ex rel. Atty. Gen. v. American Life Insurance Co.*, 162 Pa. 586. The provision of the negotiable instrument act, section 189, follows the current American law. As construing this section see *Baltimore etc. Ry. Co. v. First National Bank*, 47 S. E. 837. The minority ruling, however, is set forth in *Springfield Marine and Fire Insurance Co. v. Peck*, 102 Ill. 265; *Farmers Bank and Trust Co. v. Newland*, 97 Ky. 464. As to effect between parties see *Pease v. Laudaner*, 63 Wis. 20. But an order payable out of a particular fund may operate as an equitable assignment. *Florence Mining Co. v. Brown*, 124 U. S. 391; also *Fortier v. Delgado*, 122 Fed. 604, where check operated as an assignment.

BANKS AND BANKING—INSOLVENCY—TITLE TO DEPOSIT.—*CLARK v. TORONTO BANK ET AL.*, 82 PAC. 582 (KAN.).—*Held*, that where a bank fails and passes into the hands of a receiver after it has issued a draft upon a correspondent bank in which it has funds on deposit, and the drawee has notice of the receivership before the draft is presented for payment, the title to such deposit passes to the receiver, and the holder of the draft, in the absence of any special circumstances, is entitled to no priority over other creditors of the failed bank.

The giving of a draft does not operate as an assignment of the funds standing to the credit of the drawer. *Duncan v. Berlin*, 60 N. Y. 153. Checks drawn in the usual form, not describing any particular fund, or using any words of transfer of the whole or any part of any amount standing to the credit of the drawer, but containing only the usual request, are of the same legal effect as an inland bill of exchange, and do not amount to an assignment of the funds of the drawer in the bank. *Lunt v. Bank of North America*, 49 Barb. 221; the almost universally accepted rule being that to constitute an assignment, the order must specify the particular fund upon which it is drawn. *Atty. Gen. v. Continental Life Ins. Co.*, 71 N. Y. 325. There are, on the other hand, authorities which hold that a draft operates as an assignment of the funds on which it is drawn *pro tanto* from the very time it is drawn and delivered, on the ground that, the assignor having received a consideration for the draft, his equities are inferior to those of the payee of the draft, and as the assignee stands in the shoes of the assignor he has no better equities than the assignor. *First National Bank v. Coates*, 8 Fed. 540; *Daniels on Negot. Instruments*, sec. 1643.

CARRIERS—LOSS OF FREIGHT—DAMAGES—LIMITATION.—*HAYES v. ADAMS EXPRESS CO.*, 62 ATL. 284 (N. J.).—On delivering to a common carrier a drop curtain of ordinary character and value, the shipper received as a voucher therefor an instrument in which it was stated that, when the shipper omits to declare the value of goods, he agrees that the value does not exceed \$50.00. *Held*, that the responsibility of the carrier for the real value in case of loss was not thereby restricted unless the shipper had knowledge of the stipulation; and his knowledge that the carrier's charges depend upon the value of the goods is not sufficient to render the limit of liability obligatory.

In this country the rule is well established, that notices limiting liability are of no avail, unless assented to by the shipper. *Transportation Co. v. Newhall*, 24 Ill. 466; *Dorr v. Navigation Co.*, 11 N. Y. 485. Burden of proof is upon the carrier to establish the contract qualifying his liability, if he claims